DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 582 SP 006 518

AUTHOR Ferguson, Jon S.; Miskel, Cecil G.

TITLE The Relationships Among Pupil Control Ideology, Observed Behavior and Discipline Referrals of Public Secondary School Teachers.

PUB DATE Feb 73

NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, February 25 - March 1, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Leaders; *Discipline; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Behavior; Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

The rationale for the study of relationships between teacher-professed control ideology and their leader behavior, as observed by their pupils, was constructed from findings and conceptual assertions of Halpin, Winer, and Willower. Student discipline referral sheets were content-analyzed according to misbehavior categories. Significant ideological differences in leader behavior quartiles were not found. Significant differences, however, were found between ideology quartiles and for Initiating Structure between leader behavior and open, verbal misbehavior. The effective teacher-leader appears to achieve a delicate fusion of command and support. Comparable results to Halpin's study were obtained. (Three tables of data are included.) (Author)

FORM 910

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2.02

--NPD
SP

ED 076582

The Relationships Among Pupil Control Ideology, Observed Behavior, and Discipline Referrals of Public Secondary School Teachers

by

Jon S. Ferguson and Cecil G. Miskel

Presented to

The American Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana

February, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 006 518

The Relationships Among Pupil Control Ideology, Observed Behavior, and Discipline Referrals of Public Secondary School Teachers

by

Jon S. Ferguson and Cecil G. Miskel

In view of the multitude of studies which have been concerned with leadership, Lipham (1964) posited that it would be inconsistent with that which would normally be expected to suggest that knowledge within this area is still of a limited nature, but such is the case. Of those investigations concerning leadership, only a small fraction of the total have been concerned with it in the organizational setting, these being from the standpoint of personality traits, situation, climate, setting, style, and structure. Still, others have been concerned with the rather global aspect of behavior of the leader, but here consideration must be given to many of the above-mentioned variables; that is, the studies increasingly have come to be focused on a system of relationships rather than solely on the leader's attributes and actions (Hollander, 1971; Fiedler, 1967; Halpin, 1966).

Discipline and control today is considered to be much less a science than a matter of opinion in that objective scientific evidence about the relative merits of different types of discipline and control is extremely rare. Even the students of school management have largely neglected the problem, preoccupied as they have been

with what until recently seemed to be more pressing business: buildings, finances, and public relations.

The burden of discipline and control, in the last analysis, rests largely upon the classroom teacher for it is in the relative isolation of the classroom that school behavior is first condoned or criticized. There is little doubt that although discipline and control are the two aspects about which the beginning and experienced teacher are most concerned, they receive little or no practical instruction in the handling of this problem. The most imaginative ideas and the finest of plans are of no value if the class is "out of control."

Classroom control--whereby the teacher and student work together for a commonly held goal and behave in a mutually acceptable manner--may have different meanings to the teacher of mathematics, science, physical education, art, or music. While classroom control means that students have to cooperate with each other and with the teacher, the important consideration is the job of the teacher. As in the case of leadership, there is no one prescription for success. In view of the variables involved, identical approaches to the problems of class control do not always yield the same results.

The verbal and nonverbal behavior of the teacher is the language of actions designed to influence the behavior of those under instruction, and the hierarchically-bestowed position of the teacher places him in a position of a leader and a controller, particularly in the confines of his classroom. The teacher also possesses certain ideologies, and one function of ideology is that of structuring behavior; that is, providing an internal guide to action. There is likely to

be a moderately high correspondence between individual control ideology and control behavior in a free situation, although perfect congruence between ideology and performance is not to be expected.

Since the teacher occupies a position of leader-controller within the classroom, his behavior as a leader is subject to observation and description by his students. Consequently, a comparison can be made between observed behavior and the pupil control ideology. The objective of this investigation was to study the relationships among pupil control ideology (Willower et al., 1967), observed leader behavior (Halpin, 1966), and frequency and types of discipline referrals of public secondary school teachers.

Rationale

A review of the literature gives ample reason to believe that there is no close agreement on the conceptual definition or even upon the theoretical significance of the leadership process, thereby making the term leadership appear as a rather elusive concept. It has been concluded, however, that leadership encompasses the following: (a) the behavior of an individual while he is involved in the direction of group activities, (b) the initiation of new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives, (c) a working relationship among members of a group in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion, (d) an influencing agent, (e) the differential exertion of influence, and, (f) the influencing of members to engage in organizationally relevant behavior. Extending the foregoing to the classroom, the

position of the teacher would surely be considered to be that of a leader. A hierarchically designated position in the classroom supports the assertion that the teacher is the most important variable in that classroom.

In like manner, the continuous and pervasive behavior of the teacher places him in the position of a controller and constitutes the framework for influential behavior modification of those under his jurisdiction. The teacher tells pupils what to do, sets goals, gives directions, reprimands, admonishes, supports, encourages, grants or denies requests, clarifies and elaborates on the problem or content under discussion, asks questions, and gives cues.

This superior-subordinate relationship in the teacher-learner situation, with its bestowed power position over the pupil, makes it impossible for the teacher to act in the classroom without performing a function for some pupil, group, or the entire class.

It is clear, then, that the largest number of teaching acts fall within the category of controlling functions. These functions are not limited to the concept of discipline, in that control has to do with goal setting, and directing the pupil's attention to specific things. This can be accomplished in a direct manner of regulating, or in a neutral manner of regulating, such as in the offering of suggestions.

In order for the leader to effectively initiate structure, accomplish goals, be an influencing agent, direct activities toward organizationally relevant behavior, and exert differential influence, he must then control. From the foregoing, leadership

is posited to be synonymous with the concept of control, and therefore leadership is control.

Perceptions of Behavior

Behavior in any situation is a function of one's perception of the situation. The appropriateness of the behavior will hence depend, at least in part, on the correctness or accuracy of the perceptions. Here perceptions do not govern behavior completely; rather, the motivational system of the person will determine the ends to which his perceptions are used.

Applied to teachers' perceptions of pupils' attitudes and their interactions with pupils, this suggests that teachers' perceptions will be a function of the way in which teachers value pupils and their relationships with them. Generally, the teacher is interested in getting along smoothly with the pupils and will probably act upon his awareness of their attitudes in positive ways for the same reasons that motivated him to perceive them in a more nearly accurate manner. Helsel's work (1971) built upon that of Willower et al., (1967), and his general proposition that an individual's control ideology is inextricably bound up in his fundamental traditiona-emergent value orientation was empirically supported for all positional levels of school personnel. Thus, certain patterns of motivation, values, attitudes, perception, and havior tend to go together.

Teachers who do not value pupils positively may not perceive their attitudes accurately and behave in ways conducive to negative

reactions. At the other extreme are teachers who "need" their pupils more, perceive them with greater sensitivity and understanding, and conduct themselves in ways that elicit positive effect from the pupils.

Teachers who view pupils positively, then, should come closer to the pupils' own picture of themselves. Such a "coming closer" is what might be termed "accuracy of social perception," and this would be of a nature of supporting certain ego opinions--matters deeply relevant to each student--which each student has of himself.

In their behavioral approach to the study of leadership, Halpin and Winer (Halpin, 1966) found two dimensions of leader behavior: Consideration and Initiating Structure. These authors posited that the dimension of Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and a warmth of the relationship between the leader and members of his staff. Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

According to Halpin's concepts of observed leader behavior, the Consideration and Initiating Structure scores in the study of the aircraft commanders were plotted into four quadrants defined by coordinates corresponding to the means of the two leader behavior dimensions. The two scatter plots were then collapsed to construct a 2 X 2 classification called the Quadrant Scheme for Describing Leader Behavior (Halpin, 1966). The leaders described in Quadrant A

were evaluated as being most effective with corresponding scores of Consideration and Initiating Structure above the mean. Those leaders in Quadrant D, the upper left hand quadrant, were above the mean in Initiating Structure, but below the mean in the dimension of Consideration. These leaders were seen to be slightly less effective than those in Quadrant A and were the martinets and "cold fish" so intent upon getting the job done that they forgot they were dealing with human beings, and treated them as if they were cogs in a machine. The leaders described in the lower right hand quadrant, B, were above the mean in Consideration, but were below the mean in Initiating Structure. These leaders were considered to be less effective and Halpin describes them as oozing with the milk of human kindness, a factor contributing little to effective performance unless their Consideration behavior is accompanied by a necessary minimum of Initiating Structure behavior. Those leaders in the lower left hand quadrant, C, possessed low mean scores on both dimensions of leader behavior and were seen as being least effective of leaders in all quadrants. They were observed to be lacking in trust, warmth and friendship toward their subordinates, and, since their behavior was without organizationally relevant direction, their efforts usually resulted in group chaos.

According to these concepts of leader behavior, students would tend to describe their leaders according to the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure. As in the Halpin studies, it would seem logical that changes in attitudes of group members toward each other would be significantly associated with the leadership style of the leader.

Organizational-client adaptation and orientation. Willower's (1967) prototypes of Gilbert and Levinson's "Custodial" and "Humanistic" control ideology for pupil control in the public schools posits that the custodially-oriented teacher provides a highly controlled setting concerned primarily with the maintenance of order, characterized by impersonality, one-way downward communication, distrust of students, and a punitive, moralistic orientation. The humanistically-oriented teacher's behavior is marked by an accepting, trustful view of students, and in confidence of students' ability to be self-disciplining and responsible.

Attention thus far has been drawn to the interactive features of the concepts of leadership, control, perceptual behavior, and ideologies, both from the standpoint of the leader and those led. Of considerable significance to these conceptual variables is the matter of the organizational-client adaptation and orientation.

Carlson (1964) considers the school to be a special type of organization. He notes that some service-type organizations control the selection of their clients, while others do not. In some cases, clients can refuse to participate in the organization while in others they cannot. Public schools fall into that category whereby the organization has no control over client selection and the clients have no choice concerning their participation.

Both the school and the pupil adapt to such an arrangement in rather unique ways. The school adapts in its orientation to the clients by either segregating them, or bestowing preferntial treatment upon them. Segregation is accomplished by placing them in

ability groupings, or by placing them in the vocational and so-called "non-academic" classes. Carlson draws an interesting parallel between this "dumping" and that of the "front"- and "back"-wards concept of treatment of patients in the mental institutions. For example, the mental institutions tend to put the less "promising" patients in rather obscure, out-of-the-way wards whereby the vast majority of the public will not come into contact with them. The school in many instances places their less "promising" classes in the back wings, in the basements, or in buildings removed from the so-called "academic" wings. Preferential treatment in the public school is accomplished through various curriculum offerings, the bestowing of grades, rewards, administration of discipline, and the meting out of punishment.

The adaptation of the pupil to this orientation can be visualized as existing on a continuum from the point of total acceptance to total rejection of the school's offerings. Those pupils between the two extremes either take a "side-payments-effect" attitude (they remain in school for offerings of sports, music, drama, privilege of association with members of the opposite sex), or, they are rebellious in varying degrees evidenced by (a) "situational retirement" (they generally are compatible with the concept of school but not its offerings, and as a result they act as if the teacher is "not there"), (b) open, verbal rejection (abuse, profanities, threats, confrontation of authority), and, (c) open, nonverbal rejection (physical abuse, disregard of rules, walking out of class, excessive tardiness).

The foregoing can be conceptualized by means of the following continuum:

		Degrees of Rebellion or Rejection			
Acceptance	Side-payments effect	Situational retirement (passive-nonverbal)	Open (non-verbal)	Open (verbal)	Rejection (drop-out)

Compliance within the public school is insured through a system of rewards and penalties or sanctions. These sanctions may be primarily punitive--coercion, ridicule, withholding of rewards, and imposed discipline--or nonpunitive--understanding, emphasizing appeal to the individual's sense of right and wrong, and encouraging self-discipline, rather than imposed discipline.

Such matters, then, as values, attitudes, openness or closedness of the organizational climate, hierarchical status differentiations, societal constraints, socialization of the teacher and student subculture, organizational goals, accompanying ideologies, will affect perceptions and interactions of teachers and pupils, and, consequently, their reciprocity of observations concerning behavior.

It is reasonable to expect a correspondence between ideology and observed behavior in a free situation inasmuch as ideology in a real sense points to potential performance, performance which

is relatively authentic since the actor and his part are not mismatched. It is likewise plausible to expect that a teacher's perceptions of misbehavior in and out of the classroom will depend upon his particular ideological orientation toward control (humanistic or custodial), and, upon his observed behavior as a leader (whether he is high on both dimensions of leader behavior, low on both, or high on one and low on the other).

From this it would follow that his "motivational" system will determine to what ends his perceptions are used: that of making or not making the discipline referral.

If the teacher's motivations result in his making a student discipline referral because of perceived misbehavior from either inside or outside of the classroom setting, it was posited that he would perceive the misbehavior in the following ways: (a) open, verbal misbehavior, (b) open, nonverbal misbehavior, and, (c) passive, nonverbal misbehavior.

Hypotheses

Using the variable relationships previously discussed in the rationale, the following hypotheses were deduced:

H. 1: Teacher-leaders whose observed behavior places them in Quadrants A, B, C, or D of the Halpin Quadrant Scheme for Describing Leader Behavior will show significantly different Pupil Control Ideology scores (Table 1).

H. 2: Teacher-leaders who are classified in Quartile groups based on Pupil Control Ideology scores will be perceived as being significantly different on their (a) Consideration scores, and, (b) Initiating Structure scores (Table 2).

H. 3: Teacher-leader groups A, B, C, and D will differ significantly in frequency of discipline referrals in the three misbehavior categories and in origin of referral Table 3).

H. 4: Teacher-leaders who are classified in Quartile groups based on Pupil Control Ideology scores will differ significantly in frequency of discipline referrals in the three misbehavior categories and in origin of referral (Table 4).

Methodology

Instrumentation

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The LBDQ provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations. The LBDQ contains items, each of which describes a specific way in which a leader may behave. The respondent indicates the frequency with which he perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, and never. These responses are obtained from the members of the leader's immediate work-group, and are scored on the two dimensions of leader behavior (Consideration and Initiating Structure).

For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leader's behavior in respect to that dimension. The possible range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60.

The estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 for the Initiating Structure scores, and .92 for the Consideration scores, when corrected for attenuation.

In the administration of the LBDQ, experience suggests that a minimum of four respondents per leader is desirable and that six respondents per leader would be a good standard. Six respondents per leader were chosen in this study.

The Pupil Control Ideology Form and Personal Data Sheet. The final form of the PCI consisted of twenty items with five response categories for each item ranging from strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, to strongly disagree, respectively, with scoring reversed for the nine items positive to the humanistic viewpoint. These items were then summed to provide a single test score. The theoretical range of test scores on the final form of the instrument was 20 to 100; the higher the score, the more custodial the pupil control ideology. The range in this study was from 29 to 72.

The Pearson product-moment correlation of the half-test scores produced a coefficient of .83. Application of the Spearman-Brown formula yielded a corrected coefficient of .91. From these data, Willower et al., decided that the PCI Form was a relatively reliable measure of educators' pupil control ideology.

In the present study the primary investigator, acting as a participant-observer in the role of assistant principal, collected 1210 discipline referral sheets accompanying students referred for disciplinary action during the nine-month school year. The discipline referral sheets were content analyzed by placing them into one of the following misbehavior categories: (a) open, verbal (b) open, nonverbal, (c) passive, nonverbal, and, (d) the origin of the referral (inside or outside the classroom). Definitions for these categories are given on page 9 of this report. Using trained coders, the estimated reliability for categorization exceeded .97.

The School Selected for Study

The school selected for study was a suburban high school, grades 9-12, located in a metropolitan area. The school population, numbering 1146 students, was of a highly transient nature inasmuch as almost 40% of the pupils were dependents of Air Force and Federal personnel. There were 42 teachers, three counselors, a principal, and an assistant principal on the professional staff.

Data Collection

The data collected for this study encompassed a period from September 2, 1970, through May 28, 1971, consisting of one nine-month school year. For purposes of analysis, two teachers were deleted by random sampling to meet the assumption of equal-sized samples. A random sample of six students per teacher (240) completed the LBDQ. Discipline referral sheets were, however, collected from the 40

teachers for the 1146 students over a nine-month school year. Of the 2752 referral sheets collected, 1210 were teacher-initiated and used in the study. All 40 teachers completed the PCI Form and Personal Data Sheet.

Data Analysis

Single classification analysis of variance was used to test the relationships between leader behavior and pupil control ideology. Significant differences were analyzed by the Tukey (a) test. Relationships among the categories of discipline referral frequencies, observed leader behavior, and pupil control ideology were tested with the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance.

Findings and Discussion

No significant differences were found between observed leader behavior and pupil control ideology. Table 1 presents a summary of the leadership and control ideology data. Median scores of 39.5 for Initiating Structure and 38.5 for Consideration were used to distribute the 40 teachers equally into the four leadership quadrants.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 1 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Teachers whose PCI scores ranked them into the four quartiles ranging from humanistic to custodial were not seen to differ significantly on the leader behavior dimension of Consideration but a significant difference was shown for the dimension of Initiating Structure (Hypothesis 2, Table 2).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Hypothesis number three posited that teacher-leader groups in Quadrants A, B, C, and D would show significant differences in frequency of referrals in the three misbehavior categories and in origin of referral. The only significant difference was that of the open, verbal misbehavior category. A post-hoc procedure was conducted, using the nonparametric analogue of the Scheffé confidence interval (1966), and it was determined that Quadrant A differs from D, B differs from D, and C differs from A, B, and D. Raw data for discipline referrals in LBDQ quadrants is presented in Table 3.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 3 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

PCI-ranked teachers showed no significant differences in frequencies, categories of misbehavior, or origin of referral. Raw data for Hypothesis 4 is presented in Table 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 4 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The study supports the findings of Halpin (1966) and Fleishman and Harris (1962) that leaders high on both dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure are seen to be most effective. Such a combination of dimensions apparently is also seen by the student to be supportive and helpful. The teachers in this quadrant evidence fewer discipline problems than those low on one or both dimensions. Apparently these teacher-leaders handle the potential and real problems of misbehavior before they reach such proportions as to require them to be referred to an administrative office, or they will not perceive many of the actions of pupils as being in the category of

misbehavior as readily as will those teacher-leaders whose behavior is observed to be low on one or both dimensions of leader behavior.

Teachers whose PCI scores rank them as being neither highly humanistic nor highly custodial, but, rather, in the middle quartiles of the PCI continuum, are observed to be highest in Consideration and Initiating Structure scores and evidence fewer total discipline problems. The reverse is true for the more custodially-oriented teachers.

Teachers low on both leadership dimensions evidence a high number of referrals. Those possessing high Consideration scores, but possessing low Initiating Structure scores make a high number of open, nonverbal misbehavior referrals, suggesting tolerance for open, verbal misbehavior. Such a climate results in aggressive, open, nonverbal abuse culminating in overt classroom problems.

A dominant dimension in the surface conformity in so far as concerns open, verbal referrals seems to be that of high Initiating Structure and a lower-than-average Consideration dimension, suggesting a nomothetic classroom climate.

Implications

In his interaction with his subordinates, the effective teacher-leader seems to achieve a delicate fusion of command and support. The specific concepts of Consideration and Initiating Structure are shown to represent the qualities of "caring" and "demanding," and appear to be of considerable importance in accounting for the teacher-leader's behavior and its effect. A reciprocity of accurate

perceptions of behavior eventually seem to result in changes, in a positive way, of attitudes among the peer group.

Surface conformity appears to be achieved in a highly nomothetic climate with little consideration given to conscious or subconscious feelings, resulting in passive acceptance to outright rejection of school offerings. High Consideration dimensions unaccompanied by procedural clarity results in restive, aggressive behavior, with a consequent high number of open, nonverbal types of referrals. The aggressive student in such a climate tends to become more aggressive and the withdrawn student more withdrawn. Low scores on both dimensions of leader behavior appears to lead to a chaotic climate within the classroom, resulting in the largest number of overt problems from any leader-quadrant in the study.

There seems to be abundant evidence that, although discipline and control is the one aspect of teaching about which the beginning teacher is most concerned, little or no practical instruction is given in the handling of this problem.

Teachers need the leadership of responsible and well-trained professionals in their analysis. Many teachers possess the level of psychological sophistication needed to make creative approaches to the discipline crisis. Many do not, but aspire to work with the student on a deeper level, recognizing the presence of attitudes, feelings, and unconscious motivations which may underlie certain behavior. Many do not know how to do other than they do now. They hope that students will identify with and incorporate values held by the adult, in this case the teacher. This means bringing into

play psychological processes still little understood by most.

Ladd's charge (1971) that not one single major study in the area of discipline and control was published in the United States between 1932 and 1970 points up the need for fresh and continued research in an area in which, until recently, a cloak of silence has apparently prevailed.

Table 1

Observed Behavior and PCI Scores of Teachers According to The Halpin Quadrant Scheme for Describing Leader Behavior

Quadrant D (C-) (I.S.+)				Quadrant A (C+) (I.S.+)			
Teacher	C	I.S.	PCI	Teacher	C	I.S.	PCI
1D	29	42	54	1A	48	49	61
2D	26	40	70	2A	48	47	53
3D	33	41	61	3A	49	40	50
4D	36	46	52	4A	47	50	52
5D	27	40	57	5A	47	41	29
6D	34	41	61	6A	47	42	39
7D	36	42	51	7A	43	42	72
8D	33	42	58	8A	43	43	55
9D	38	44	48	9A	46	43	59
10D	38	40	62	10A	40	42	56
$\bar{X}$	33	41.8	57.4	$\bar{X}$	45.8	43.9	52.6
1C	33	38	62	1B	44	39	54
2C	25	32	68	2B	41	39	62
3C	31	31	65	3B	43	39	57
4C	32	35	50	4B	40	38	50
5C	31	36	52	5B	40	37	62
6C	31	35	68	6B	42	35	54
7C	34	36	46	7B	40	38	52
8C	34	36	58	8B	39	36	51
9C	37	36	47	9B	39	34	43
10C	33	32	43	10C	39	32	66
$\bar{X}$	32.1	34.7	55.9	$\bar{X}$	40.7	36.7	55.1
Quadrant C (C-) (I.S.-)				Quadrant B (C+) (I.S.-)			

Initiating Structure Median 39.5

38.5 Consideration Median

Theoretical range: Consideration dimension 0-60
Initiating Structure dimension 0-60

Table 3

Observed Behavior and Control Ideology Means
by PCI Quartiles

PCI Quartiles	1	2	3	4
	More humanistic (H)	Humanistic	Custodial	More custodial (C)
Initiating Structure	37.8	41.1	41.6	37.6
Consideration	39.6	39.2	38.1	34.7
Pupil Control Ideology	44.5	52.5	58.3	65.7

Table 3

Discipline Referrals in LBDQ Quadrants

Quadrant D (C-) (I.S.+)						Quadrant A (C+) (I.S.+)					
Teacher	OV	ONV	PNV	I	O	Teacher	OV	ONV	PNV	I	O
1D	1	3	0	3	1	1A	8	3	0	8	3
2D	3	11	0	5	9	2A	16	21	0	34	3
3D	4	16	0	18	2	3A	1	7	3	10	1
4D	9	23	2	5	29	4A	0	1	0	0	1
5D	3	19	0	22	0	5A	4	1	0	4	1
6D	2	31	2	17	18	6A	4	26	1	25	8
7D	2	44	2	31	17	7A	10	45	2	47	10
8D	1	47	1	45	4	8A	14	4	1	19	0
9D	0	5	0	1	4	9A	7	16	0	19	4
10D	2	28	0	30	0	10A	5	23	0	23	5
$\bar{X}$	2.7	22.7	0.7	17.7	8.4	$\bar{X}$	6.9	14.9	0.7	18.9	3.6
1C	15	18	0	33	0	1B	3	44	6	27	26
2C	8	20	0	11	17	2B	0	0	0	0	0
3C	38	61	0	97	2	3B	0	4	0	2	2
4C	5	21	0	26	0	4B	14	73	1	66	22
5C	2	13	8	21	2	5B	6	31	0	30	7
6C	5	15	0	10	10	6B	3	6	1	10	0
7C	20	39	3	54	8	7B	9	8	0	17	0
8C	18	16	13	34	13	8B	2	14	3	15	5
9C	12	14	0	23	3	9B	23	50	0	33	40
10C	5	12	0	11	6	10B	18	23	1	32	10
$\bar{X}$	12.8	22.9	2.4	32.0	6.1	$\bar{X}$	7.8	25.3	1.2	23.1	11.2
Quadrant C (C-) (I.S.-)						Quadrant B (C+) (I.S.-)					

39.5
I.S. Median

38.5
Consideration Median

OV=Open, Verbal Misbehavior
ONV= Open, Nonverbal Misbehavior
PNV=Passive, Nonverbal Misbehavior

I=Inside classroom
O=Outside classroom

Table 4

Discipline Referrals in PCI
Quartiles

Quartile 3						Quartile 2					
Teacher	OV	ONV	PNV	I	O	Teacher	OV	ONV	PNV	I	O
1D	8	3	0	8	3	1A	16	21	0	34	3
2D	14	4	1	19	0	2A	0	1	0	0	1
3D	7	16	0	19	4	3A	3	44	6	27	26
4D	5	23	0	23	5	4A	3	6	1	10	0
5D	0	4	0	2	2	5A	9	8	0	17	0
6D	18	16	13	34	13	6A	2	14	3	14	5
7D	4	16	0	18	2	7A	2	13	8	21	2
8D	3	19	0	22	0	8A	1	3	0	3	1
9D	2	31	2	17	18	9A	9	23	2	5	29
10D	1	47	1	45	4	10A	2	44	2	31	17
X	6.2	17.9	1.7	20.7	5.1		4.7	17.7	2.2	16.2	8.4
Quartile 4						**Quartile 1**					
1C	10	45	2	47	10	1B	1	7	3	10	1
2C	0	0	0	0	0	2B	4	1	0	4	1
3C	6	31	0	30	7	3B	4	28	1	25	8
4C	18	23	1	32	10	4B	14	73	1	66	22
5C	15	18	0	33	0	5B	23	50	0	33	40
6C	8	20	0	11	17	6B	5	21	0	26	0
7C	38	61	0	97	2	7B	20	39	3	54	8
8C	5	15	0	10	10	8B	12	14	0	23	3
9C	3	11	0	5	9	9B	5	12	0	11	6
10C	2	28	0	30	0	10B	0	5	0	1	4
X	10.5	25.2	0.3	29.5	6.5		8.8	25.0	0.8	25.3	9.3

OV = Open, Verbal Misbehavior
ONV= Open, Nonverbal Misbehavior
PNV= Passive, Nonverbal Misbehavior

I = Inside classroom
O = Outside classroom

REFERENCES

Carlson, R. Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: The public school and its clients. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, 1964.

Fiedler, F. E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 15, Spring, 1962.

Halpin, A. Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Helsel, R. Value orientation and pupil control ideology of public school educators. Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, 1971.

Hollander, E. Style, structure, and setting in organizational leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly, March, 1971.

Ladd, E. Toward an educationally appropriate legal definition of disruptive student behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, #3, Autumn, 1971.

Lipham, J. Leadership and administration. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, 1964.

Willower, D., Eidell, T., & Hoy, W. The school and pupil control ideology. Pennsylvania State University Studies # 24. University Park: Pennsylvania State Press: 1967.